Introduction. This study showcases the important parts of Ukraine’s history of contacts with NATO, challenges the stale definitions of “Euro-Atlantic integration” and shows the nation’s main allies and foes in its partnership with NATO.

Review of recent publications. Major issues of Ukraine’s political and military cooperation with NATO (specifically its partnership with Poland in this regard) in the context of the Euro-Atlantic integration were examined in the works of O. Sanzharevsky, P. Gritsak, V. Borohvostov, I. Fanin and others [1; 2; 3; 4]. These works formed an important background for further study of military-political cooperation in the following framework of the Atlantic integration of Ukraine due to the wide presentation of the factual material. I. Todorov in his work “Cooperation of Ukraine and Poland: military-technical dimension” highlighted the issue of relations between Ukraine and Poland in the context of their participation in the processes of European and Euro-Atlantic integration to support security and stability in Europe; he revealed the interconnection of this cooperation area with collective security projects in Europe, primarily NATO initiatives [5].

Particular emphasis should be placed on I. Todorov’s monograph “Ukraine on the road to the European and Euro-Atlantic community”. On the example of the Donetsk region I. Todorov has shown the success and problems of Euro-Atlantic integration, including surveys of certain groups of the population and examining the differences in understanding of the European and Atlantic integration among the populace, along with the people’s attitude towards NATO countries, as well as the use of the Polish and other Euro-Atlantic integration experience [6].

Objectives of the paper. The author intends to provide with unique chronology of the Ukrainian history in the context of the Atlantic integration attempts, to showcase how Ukraine’s policies on NATO resulted in gaining allies on the nation’s path towards integration, as well as foes striving to stop or halt these attempts.

Results of the research. Looking at the early days of Ukraine—NATO contacts, one can observe nearly no talks or forums, and complete absence of the official treaties with NATO until 1994. According to J. Draus, the Polish researcher, Ukraine’s position at that time was infected with Russia’s influence on the Polish-
Ukrainian discourse of relations with NATO, noting that simultaneously with the difficulties in the Polish-Ukrainian negotiations, the Russian side “officially” informed the Ukrainian side about Poland’s offer to the Kremlin to refuse support of Ukraine’s independence instead of support of Russia’s entry into NATO.

Recently Ukraine has ended up in a diplomatic conflict with Hungary: a NATO member began to block the Euro-Atlantic initiatives of the Ukrainian side because of disagreement with the new Ukrainian educational reform. From the Polish side, Ukraine immediately received offers of ‘alternative dialogue with NATO’: as Jacek Czaputowicz, the Polish Foreign Minister, claimed, NATO-Ukraine Commission meetings would have to find another format for meetings through the position of Hungary [7]. A little bit earlier, the prime ministers of Poland and Ukraine during the telephone conversation confirmed the strategic partnership of both countries in these areas: “The Head of the Council of Ministers emphasizes that Poland supports and will support the Euro-Atlantic aspirations of Ukraine” [8]. President of Ukraine Petro Poroshenko noted the important role of Poland in the Ukrainian interaction with NATO countries, recalled the historic NATO Summit in Warsaw and the decision of the NATO-Ukraine Commission, the adoption of the important decisions on the establishment of Trust Funds, the approval of the Program on Strategic Communication and Cybersecurity, other important areas of Ukraine’s support and its further integration into the North Atlantic Alliance system [9]. The active interest of the Republic of Poland in facilitating Ukraine to join NATO is obvious, as well as conflicts with the wishes of some other members of the bloc (e.g. Hungary).

Juxtaposing the chronology of the Atlantic integration with European, one can notice that related processes are not universally linked, although this question remains controversial. Of course, on the one hand, one could note that the important parts of the 1999 NATO-Ukraine cooperation (the opening of the NATO Liaison Office in Kyiv) happened in the same year, when Ukraine’s integration into the EU was declared a key foreign policy priority in the inaugural speech of President of Ukraine Leonid Kuchma, while the EU Common Strategy on Ukraine was formally adopted at the Helsinki Summit of the European Council. The Republic of Poland became a full member of NATO in 1999 and officially received an invitation to join the EU (it happened in 2004), which allowed Poland to become a ‘leader’ of the Euro-Atlantic aspirations of Ukraine. This trend (with the accession of the Central and Eastern European countries to NATO and afterwards the EU) left many in Ukraine with the expectation that joining NATO is a prerequisite for joining the EU, and forced us all to talk about ‘the Euro-Atlantic integration’. It’s possible to observe that certain issues which should be centered on NATO’s competencies have also been addressed in the EU forums (like the creation of LITPOLUKRBRIG, announced at the EU Ministers Council).

Despite the declaration of the pro-NATO course by President of Ukraine Viktor Yushchenko (and the fierce opposition and anti-propaganda by the Party of Regions and Left forces), it was during the years of Leonid Kuchma’s presidency that the most important events of the Atlantic integration took place (with the beginning of the official NATO-Ukraine cooperation and the actual participation of Ukraine in
military operations on the side of the alliance) due to the extensive control of the presidential administration over all processes in the country. At the same time, the 2005–2013 period in the history of cooperation in the framework of the Atlantic integration is more likely to be characterized by stagnation due to the lack of unanimity in the Ukrainian politics of joining NATO: the creation of LITPOLUKRBRIG, launched in 2008, turned into a truly cinematographic ‘development hell’ (the term for the long-term production of movies), which took more than 6 years (with an additional period of ratification in 2015–2016).

**Conclusion.** I. Todorov’s viewpoint has been still relevant as in the early years of the XXI century. The main direction of the Ukrainian Atlantic cooperation with other Central European council was the ‘creative borrowing’ of the Polish experience of joining the European Union and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Only after 2015, after confirmation of the European aspirations of Ukraine through the Association Agreement with the EU, we see the return of the Ukrainian leadership to a wider cooperation with NATO and strong support from Poland in this respect. Overall, the development of the Polish-Ukrainian cooperation in the Atlantic context has led to positive results in the areas of defense capabilities of both countries, ensuring Ukraine’s sovereignty, the important part of the security strategy in the eastern region of Europe.
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THE ROLE OF «SOFT POWER» IN CHINESE EDUCATION SYSTEM

Introduction. Today, a cultural factor is one of the key elements of the so-called "soft power". In the whole world the influence of this aspect on the general socio-economic processes, interstate relations and ties is increasing. In international politics it has obtained a new meaning nowadays. Accordingly, many states are beginning to pay more attention to their cultural policies, the term "external cultural policy" is being increasingly used as export, dissemination and popularization of national culture or, conversely, rejection of foreign cultural expansion becomes a more effective instrument of foreign policy. Foreign cultural policy can also serve as an effective ideological tool that helps to carry out foreign policy strategies of states, creating a solid foundation that would allow them to promote and defend their national interests in the international arena, and, as well, have a significant impact on social development processes.

Review of recent publications. The issue of «soft power» has been discussed in numerous research works of both Ukrainian and foreign scholars. Among them are J. Nye, S. Vinsen-Lankran [1], M. Moore, O. Koval, M. Mukhina, S. Brozytov, M. Pozina, V.S. Kim, Ya.A. Bokhan [5] and others. Nevertheless, more attention needs to be given to the above mentioned subject.

Objective of the paper is to analyse and clarify the role of soft power as one of the priority elements in China's foreign policy activities.

Results of the research. The field of education also plays an important part in the implementation of the "soft power" strategy. Foreign students at Chinese universities are one of the most effective directions in this area. Among the governmental institutions, responsible for such programs, are the China Scholarship Council, the Office for International Cooperation and Exchanges, and other organizations under the Ministry of Education of the People's Republic of China. Educational institutions and industry as well as non-governmental organizations also monitor student mobility and China’s cooperation in the field of education, in addition to state authorities. According to data as for 2010, international exchanges of